/390 cont./

125 434 artisans it was necessary, aside from their family accounts, to consider those of their occupational activity; with regard to the cultivators, it is certainly /391/ among them that the greatest percentage of error is found. We have taken into account the proceeds from the sale of their harvest, often underestimated by the one concerned, the portion for home consumption, and the income obtained by supplementary activities practiced in the dry season, in order to arrive at an income figure that could be compared to that for salaried workers.

125 434 462 [536] [565] But, nearly all of the women, almost all of whom declare themselves to be "without occupation," have minor sources of income that permit them to balance a budget, or at least partially to make up a deficit. It is often a matter of small-scale commerce, sometimes domestic work, and sometimes the talents of an actress which attract sympathy and gifts, as we verified for a family of the griot /singer, storyteller/ caste. It was therefore necessary to look closely at each case before setting an exact figure. We nevertheless believe that we have been mistaken in two or three cases, which will reveal themselves below.

125 434 592 Of course, there were often cases where in a family, or rather let us say in the same "unit of consumption," since this is the term that we shall use most often (1), several persons

[104] [594]

1. Each time that we speak of "family," it is actually the unit of consumption that is involved. To designate the familial grouping in the Western sense of the word, we shall use the term "restricted family."

received income. The entire income retained is not always the sum of these incomes. We have studied the budgets of groups and not the budgets of individuals. Now, these groups, these "units of consumption," only rarely correspond to the restricted family of Western type. They often contain individuals who, whether or not they have a kin tie with a member of the restricted family, on the one hand participate in the economic

/393 cont./

125 592 *511 Finally, according to the number of persons making up the unit of consumption:

5 of less than 5 persons.
18 of 5 to 9 persons.
12 of 10 to 14 persons.
5 of 15 to 19 persons.
3 of 20 persons and more.

[434] On all of these points the distribution is nearly normal. Only the group with incomes of 15,000 to 20,000 francs is somewhat scantily represented, the average of the lower group being perhaps, on the contrary, somewhat too high.

125 *511 But this apparent balance presents a problem; every family, or nearly every one, has its own characteristics, and there are no two that are strictly comparable. This is why, in order to facilitate an understanding of certain points concerning the consumption of food commodities, we have had recourse to a device that is a little risky; from the standards utilized for the calculation of theoretical food requirements by the Institut National d'Hygiène de Paris, we have used for men, for women, and for children, according to their age category, a coefficient:

1 for men
0.8 for the women,
0.5 for children from 2 to 6 years old,
0.7 for children from 7 to 12 years old,
0.8 for children from 13 to 20 years old.

/394/ By addition, we have obtained a theoretical composition of the unit of consumption in men alone. We can then calculate the consumption of this theoretical man. Nursing children have been included in the category of 2 to 5 years old, but we have allowed the coefficient of 0.8 for nursing women. This compensates for that.

*511 592 594 Table I,[1] gives the composition of the unit of consumption in men, women, and children, and in the last column its composition in "man units." The column preceding the one for the

[1] [see cat. 116, pp 11-12. - ANALYST]

/394 cont./

*511 592 ● 594 unit of consumption (U. C.) contains a figure indicating how many persons make up the restricted family constituting the nucleus of each unit of consumption.

There is absolute correspondence in only 5 cases: Nos. 6, 9, 26, 34, and 42.

[595] Family No. 6 contains, besides the head of the family, a mattress-maker, and his two wives, two daughters that he had by his first wife, one by his second wife, and one by a third, deceased wife.

The baker, head of family No. 9, has only one wife. But she previously had two children before this marriage, a girl and a boy. Both of them live with the head of the family. The daughter, previously married, then divorced, has with her a child six years old. Finally, there is a child of the two spouses.

With No. 26 we truly find a family of Western type: a man, his wife, and their only child. The head of the family is 28 years old, just like that of family No. 34, which likewise includes a man, his wife, and two children. It is true that this young clerk of the P. T. T. has married a second wife, who lives in Dakar.

[595] Finally, in family No. 42, the head of the family, who has two wives, lives alone with them and their eight children, of whom one is already grown-up.

Aside from these four families, all of the units of consumption contain one or several external elements with or without kin ties with the familial nucleus.

*511 592 This almost general "parasitism" (1) is more important in

1. The word is customary. We put it between quotation marks in order to indicate to what degree it is inadequate. It is wrong primarily because of being pejorative, since it designates a traditional phenomenon.

/395/ Table 1

*511
592
594

No.	Income	Restricted Family	U.C.	M	W	2-6	7-12	13-20	Theor. U.C.
1	5,800	7	13	3	3	3	1	3	10
2	6,100	5	10	1	1	3	2	1	5.5
3	6,500	3	4	1	2	0	0	0	2.8
4	6,700	4	7	1	3	2	1	0	5.10
5	6,745	5	7	2	2	1	1	1	5.6
6	7,000	7	7	1	2	3	1	0	4.8
7	7,000	2	5	1	2	1	1	0	3.8
8	7,410	2	5	2	3	0	0	0	4.4
9	7,500	6	6	1	2	0	2	1	4.4
10	8,150	8	12	2	6	1	1	2	9.6
11	8,950	3	6	1	2	1	2	0	4.5
12	9,000	4	8	3	2	2	1	0	6.3
13	9,800	3	5	2	2	0	0	1	4.4
14	10,000	10	10	3	3	1	2	2	8.9
15	10,000	6	7	2	2	1	2	0	5.5
16	10,675	3	4	1	1	0	2	0	3.2
17	10,800	5	9	1	3	1	2	2	6.9
18	11,000	3	4	2	2	0	0	0	3.6
19	11,950	5	9	4	2	3	0	0	7.1
20	12,000	6	10	3	3	3	1	0	7.6
21	13,000	5	5	1	2	1	1	0	3.8
22	14,000	8	12	2	5	2	3	0	9.1
23	15,000	14	18	4	4	6	0	4	13.4
24	15,000	17	21	2	5	8	4	2	14.4
25	15,630	7	15	4	5	3	0	3	11.9
26	15,800	4	4	1	1	1	0	0	2.3
27	16,200	10	12	2	3	2	3	2	9.1
28	22,000	16	18	4	4	1	2	7	14.7
29	22,000	4	11	4	3	3	1	0	8.6
30	24,000	5	7	1	3	2	1	0	5.1
31	25,000	10	18	2	3	1	1	11	14.4

/395 Table I cont./

*511
592
594

No.	Income	Restricted Family	U.C.	M	W	2-6	7-12	13-20	Theor. U.C.
32	25,000	5	6	2	1	1	1	1	4.8
33	25,000	4	7	1	2	2	1	1	5.1
34	25,900	4	4	2	1	1	0	0	3.3
35	27,000	5	6	1	2	1	1	1	4.6
36	34,000	3	15	4	7	1	0	3	12.5
37	36,000	11	24	7	10	2	2	3	19.8
38	50,000	5	13	5	5	3	0	0	10.5
39	51,000	6	11	1	3	2	4	1	8.0
40	55,000	15	24	4	9	7	4	0	17.5
41	55,000	8	14	2	6	3	3	0	10.4
42	56,000	11	11	2	2	1	3	3	8.6
43	81,000	4	5	2	1	1	1	0	4.0

/396 cont./

*511
[434]

43 also has two incomes (the same as No. 25).

A comparison of the incomes and expenses, up until about the middle of the table, shows an excess of expenses, sometimes not very important, but nevertheless exceeding 1,000 francs in two cases (Nos, 4 and 20). One might view this as the result of an error of estimation, either in the incomes or in the expenses. But it must not be forgotten that only routine expenses are still being dealt with, that is to say, for the small incomes that concern us now, the outlays made for food. It is therefore necessary to add to this figure all of the other expenses which we have calculated for a period of a year (divided by 12, of course). Table III,[1] where we have shown the monthly deficit in absolute value and in percentage of income, shows us what our budgets then become: the highest deficit is 45.2%, the lowest /397/ /Table II appears here/ /398/ 6.4% (1). (This last, strangely enough, is found

1. We are not counting here the

1[See cat 116, pp 17-18 - ANALYST]

17: Mercier--21 S-5 (1953-1954) 1954 MS37 Senegal MS37
Dakar

/22 cont./

salient aspects of the present situation; we shall then turn to some monographic examples. Thus the orientation of our investigations will summarily appear. 369* [121]

A. -- The changes in the organization and the family values form a whole. The correlations that appear between the facts that we have retained for illustration will suffice to indicate it.

We have noted that in town, in most cases, there is topographic dispersion of the ethnic groups and the more restricted kinship groups. It must in no way be concluded that there is a general rupture of the kinship structures; all the ties are not cut. Only the facts of neighborhood and kinship do not reinforce each other any more, in accordance with the typical process of traditional situations. A first examination of the variations in numerical importance of groups of relatives living together will permit one to define the present tendencies. We shall see that the instituting of a new situation where the household /maisonnée/ (1) 621 369* [592] [594]

1. Cf. below for the definition of this idea.

tends to coincide with the restricted family /famille restreinte/ has progressed unequally, depending on the social categories (2).

2. See above (I, B, 4) the brief information given on the socio-occupational categories.

We have said why, especially where marriage is concerned, the considerations of the family structure proper cannot be separated from the problems posed by ethnic affiliation. The multiplication of interethnic marriages is a symptom of important social changes. It must likewise be noted that, the less numerically important an ethnic group is in the town, the more the simple ethnic relationship tends to play the role of ties of closer relationship. [593]

The structure of the restricted family itself is subject to variations. Here in particular the question of polygamy poses 369* 595

/23 cont./ 369*
59

2. The figures which follow will give a first idea of the size of the groups. They apply to the male heads of ménages (monogamous and polygamous), the bachelors and groups of bachelors being excluded. We made a simple count of the persons belonging to the household outside of the ménage investigated (man, wife or wives, children living with their parents, adopted children) (2). One obtains the following results:

2. We will see further on what has to be understood concretely by "adoption" in the Dakar urban context. This only concerns the effectively grouped ménage; if certain wives and their children do not live in the household considered, they are not counted.

a) For the whole of the population studied, or 915 male heads of ménages, 41% of the households coincide with the restricted family, 32% include one person in addition to the restricted family, 14% include two, 5% include three, 2% include four, 1% include five, 1% include more than five (3). [594] [162]

3. These percentages, as well as those that follow, are calculated faultily. They can only be approximations, under the conditions of the investigation. The expression in percentage, however, strikingly illustrates the indications gathered. The tendencies that they show have been corroborated for most of the categories by many subsequent interviews. [128]

/24/ The following table divides this population into socio-occupational categories: [565]

Socio-occupational Category	Number of Households	Number of persons not belonging to the restricted family (%)						
		0	1	2	3	4	5	+5
Farmers, fishermen	23	47%	26%	13%	4%		2%	2%
Laborers, domestics	124	35%	37%	12%	8%	4%	0.5%	0.5%
Workers and artisans	290	38%	29%	14%	6%	3%	3%	2%
Master workmen	21	23%	23%	42%		10%		
Subordinate employees and functionaries	265	42%	33%	13%	4%	3%	3%	2%
Superior employees and functionaries	39	46%	43%	7%		2%		
Teaching, intellectual professions, etc.	48	46%	35%	14%	4%			1%
Merchants, transport, etc.	122	38%	36%	13%	7%	2%	1%	1%

/24 cont./

17: Mercier--24 S-5 (1953-1954) 1954 MS37 Senegal MS37
Dakar

369 x
592
565
594

/24 cont./

369x
592
565
594

b) These simplified data call for some commentary. What is the significance of the sometimes important differences that we affirm between the situations that prevail in the different strata?

The high proportion, among the farmers, of households that coincide with the restricted family -- a proportion clearly higher than the average -- is explained by the fact that we are dealing more with market-gardeners than with farmers of the traditional type (as are found in the suburban villages). In any case, the problem has not been studied for a sufficient number of cases for us to draw definitive conclusions here. [241]

/25/ Besides this category, for which we lack certain explanatory factors, only two others noticeably exceed the average established for the whole population: on the one hand, the superior employees and functionaries; on the other hand, members of the teaching profession, doctors, etc. The important factor here is the degree of Westernization (1). [177] [871]

1. The only categories whose members have all been to the French school.

It is only on this level that we have ascertained facts not only on the topological dispersion of the group of relatives, but also on the very clear loosening of the obligations flowing from kinship ties. Let us add that in reality the number of restricted families is much more important. In the majority of households which include one person in addition to the restricted family, this person is a domestic lodging with the family (who is sometimes a distant relative). The change in structure is therefore clearer than it would seem in view of the raw figures. [357]

c) This first general view shows, as in other domains -- we shall see this soon for the structure of even the restricted family -- that the characteristics of the socio-occupational

369x
565

/25 cont./

strata which we have defined do not depend on a single factor or on a series of factors in close correlation; it would be a simplification to establish a hierarchy based on certain criteria. There are in fact several scales. There is more or less complete participation in several socio-cultural contexts. We are dealing here with three principal groups: 369x 565

On the one hand, the categories of laborers and domestics, workers and artisans, master workmen, merchants, and, to a lesser degree, farmers and fishermen (2), where the

2. See above.

tendency toward familial regrouping is still very much alive. The extent of the familial group is as a whole a function of the possibilities for housing and of available finances (the maximum number of persons which a given number of salaried persons can support). It must likewise be noted that, in the case of autochthonous groups or groups originally from nearby regions, the frequency of neighboring and related households is much greater, and the tendency towards a reconstitution of the extended family /famille etendue/ manifests itself in a considerable number of cases. [596]

On the other hand, the categories of the superior functionaries and employees and the teaching and intellectual professions, in which, if one keeps in mind the preceding remarks, one sees that the household tends in permanent fashion to include only the restricted family. [594]

Finally, the category of subordinate employees and functionaries, intermediate between the two preceding groups, which is explained in particular by the composite character of this category; there, one /26/ finds elements (orderlies, beneficiaries of reserved employment in the administrative sector, etc.) clearly less Westernized, but their very superior living standard does not permit placing them in the category of laborers, whom they approximate in many aspects. The [177]

/33 cont./ 369[x] 592
and then four adults living on one salary, and subsequently four adults living on two salaries.

G. -- One sees by these examples how a "snapshot" of the situation only furnishes an approximate picture of the totality of the facts. The preceding pages have shown, however, that it does draw an outline of it; it is therefore possible to put down some remarks in the guise of conclusions.

1. The situation is not fixed. The restricted family clearly tends to constitute a milieu of life more closed than [594]● in the traditional framework, and to coincide with the household. But this tendency, even in the most Westernized categories, is far from having caused the traditional forms to re- [182] treat everywhere. The obligations founded on kinship in the [602] broad sense are still strongly felt. But one has seen that a first step toward their gradual weakening has already been made with the transformation of the character of the de facto groupings (extent, structure, etc.). Doubtlessly for a long time yet there will continue to be a gap between the values recognized by the members of these societies and the new structures born out of the transformations imposed from the outside. As for the structure of the restricted family, the proportion of polygamists, for all the cases studied, seems to be [595] at the average level which it attains in a demographically normal population. A regression of polygamy, however, appears to have started in the categories which represent a new type of elite with Western instruction.

2. The variations in the extent and the structure of both the broad group of relatives and the restricted family are not linked in a constant manner to the differences in living standard. [182] The situations /34/ can be extremely variable with equal resources (1). The relation is well marked (2) only in the

1. As the investigations on family budgets conducted in Thiès have indeed shown.